



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,370	02/10/2004	Alazel Acheson	MSFT-3026 / 307009.01	3201

41505 7590 05/06/2009

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)  
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR  
2929 ARCH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
----------

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/06/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/776,370

**Applicant(s)**

ACHESON ET AL.

**Examiner**

Sathyanarayan Pannala

**Art Unit**

2164

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sathyanarayan Pannala.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Lori Anne D. Swanson, Reg. No. 59,048.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 31-34.

Identification of prior art discussed: Paster et al. (US Patent 6,681,383) and Harris (USPA Pub. 2002/0059204 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the objection to specification amendment. Examiner suggested to provide the paragraph number with reference to original specification. Examiner explained how to amend claims to overcome rejection of claims 31 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. under 101. Applicant discussed the proposed claim 31 amendment with reference to prior art by Paster and Applicant is positive that the amended limitations are not taught by the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164